

6/24/95

C. E. Pearce

10.000

W. F. R

E 713
.P35
Copy 1

ANNEXATION OF HAWAII.

"Westward the course of empire takes its way."

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES E. PEARCE,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

JUNE 14, 1898.

WASHINGTON.
1898.

36051

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES E. PEARCE.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. Res. 259) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States—

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I listened with deep and pleasurable interest on Friday last to the very eloquent argument of my learned friend from Arkansas [Mr. DIXMORE], because, however much I may disagree with him in his views, I have come to know that he is a fair debater, and I sought to learn from the views which he presented on the subject the gist of the contention against the resolutions which are before us for consideration. He gave us much generality over the alleged unconstitutionality of this proceeding, but without going into an extended discussion of the question, I sincerely hope that some gentleman who succeeds me in this debate will take the trouble to point out one single sentence, or line, or word of the Constitution of the United States that contravenes the adoption of these resolutions. It is a matter of history familiar to everybody that every square mile of territory which has been annexed to the United States since the foundation of the Government has been so annexed under the "general welfare" clause of the Constitution.

The Louisiana Territory, embracing 1,179,931 square miles, was annexed under that provision in 1803; Florida, embracing 59,268 square miles, was annexed under it in 1819; Texas, embracing 376,133 square miles, was annexed under it in 1845; New Mexico and California, embracing 345,783 square miles, were annexed under it in 1848; the Gadsden purchase, embracing 45,535 square miles, was made in pursuance of it in 1853; Alaska, embracing 577,390 square miles, was annexed under it in 1867; and under it it is proposed to annex the Territory of Hawaii, with its 7,000 square miles, in this year of our Lord 1898.

The constitutional questions connected with these various transactions, by which the national area has been increased from first to last nearly 3,000,000 square miles, have been passed upon time and time again by the Supreme Court of the United States, and I had supposed until this hour that the right of annexing foreign territory was a settled question and not open to further discussion excepting for a filibuster against the proposed resolutions.

My learned friend has announced an apparently unique discovery, but which in point of fact is well known to everyone who has ever studied the map of the world or has traveled upon the

Pacific Ocean; he states to us that the distance from San Francisco via Unalaska to Hongkong, and of course to the Philippine Islands, is shorter as a sailing route than the distance from San Francisco to the same points via Honolulu, and therefore the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands is an unnecessary measure for purposes of public defense.

It is true that there is a port at Unalaska; it is also true that the northern route from San Francisco to Hongkong and to the Philippine Islands is shorter than the route via Honolulu; it is also true that the Empress Line of steamers, an English line which sails from Vancouver to Yokohama and thence to Hongkong, crosses the Pacific Ocean within sight of the Aleutian Islands. I myself have been over that route, and so has the gentleman from Arkansas, and the statement which he makes in regard to it is unquestionably true. But, Mr. Speaker, what does that prove? Does it establish the contention that the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands is an undesirable act upon the part of this Government? Does it establish the contention that those islands are not necessary to the proper defense of the Pacific coast? By no means.

Suppose, for instance, that the Hawaiian Islands should pass under the control of the English Government, a contingency not altogether improbable or remote if we do not take them in ourselves. Now, draw a line from Vancouver or Esquimalt to the Hawaiian Islands, a distance of a little more than 2,000 miles; draw another line from the Hawaiian Islands to the Isthmus of Panama, a distance of a little more than 4,000 miles; consider the fact that the Hawaiian Islands extend from north to south a distance of 400 miles, and take into consideration the military aspects of that situation, with the English Government fortified at Esquimalt commanding the outlet of Puget Sound, fortified at Honolulu and Pearl Harbor, and fortified at the western terminus of the isthmian canal, and is it not conclusive that under this proposed condition of things the entire Pacific coast will be at the mercy of the British Government in the contingency of war? Let me inform you, gentlemen, that the English Government has already acquired an exclusive franchise upon Lake Nicaragua, and has been seeking an isthmian route across the narrow neck of land that separates North and South America. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, if for no other, the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands at this time seems to me to be not only a desirable but a necessary measure on the part of the people of the United States.

But, say my learned friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] and also my learned friend from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands will mark a new era in the history of our country, and that by it we will enter upon a great expansive colonial policy, the end of which no man can measure. Mr. Speaker, not one intimation of a colonial policy has ever been connected with the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands. This question has occupied the thought of our country for over fifty years. There never has been and is not now advanced any proposition to annex Hawaii as a colonial possession of the United States, and there is no point whatsoever in the contention that this annexation, in any form, manner, or shape, commits either Congress or any gentleman who votes for annexation to a colonial policy.

I am myself at the present time opposed to such a policy, not as a question of legal and constitutional right, but simply and solely as a question of wisdom; and unless the exigencies of the future

shall lead me to modify my judgment in that regard, I shall remain in opposition to such a policy. What may become necessary for us to do in settling the details of a future treaty of peace with Spain no man can tell. No one would be reckless enough to commit himself upon that subject. Let me call your attention to the treaty itself, made by the present Administration and the Government of Hawaii in 1897. I quote the language of the treaty: "And it is agreed that all the territory of and appertaining to the Republic of Hawaii is hereby annexed to the United States of America under the name of the Territory of Hawaii." So that upon the consummation of this transaction the relation of the United States Government to Hawaii will become exactly the same as the relation of the United States Government to Alaska at the present time.

Mr. DINSMORE. Will it interrupt my friend if I ask him a question in this connection?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. By no means; not at all.

Mr. DINSMORE. I should like my friend to state to the House whether he can trace any relation between that defunct treaty and these resolutions.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. It has not yet transpired that the treaty referred to by my friend is in any sense defunct. It stands before the Senate to-day as an open question. But irrespective of whether it is or not defunct, these resolutions if adopted by Congress will be carried out upon the lines of that treaty, and the honor and good faith of the people of the United States require and will demand that they shall be carried out upon those lines. When the Hawaiian Islands are taken in under the sovereignty of the United States Government, they will come to us as the Territory of Hawaii, and in no other form, and there are ample provisions in these resolutions for such a consummation.

This leads me, Mr. Speaker, to answer another question propounded during this debate by nearly every gentleman who has occupied a position of antagonism to the pending measure, and that is, "What are you going to do with these islands? How are you going to govern them?" This question seems to be a great obstacle in the way of very many of my friends who have taken part in this discussion. Of course I can not tell, nor can any other man tell, what the Congress of the United States will do in reference to this question, or what provision of government it will legislate into existence. I can only express my own opinion upon that subject, and whether it be worth much or little, if I should happen to be in Congress when the subject comes to be dealt with, I can tell you without any hesitation what I will do. I will vote for a Territorial government in Hawaii. In my opinion it will have a Territorial governor, it will have a Territorial legislature and judicial officers, a government, in short, of the same or similar character as that which exists in Arizona, in New Mexico, in Oklahoma, and in Alaska, with such modifications, of course, as may be suitable to the present or future condition of things. People who imagine that the constitutional electors of Hawaii are incapable of self-government, or are lacking in intelligence, or are unlettered or illiterate are very much mistaken. I have myself no trouble upon that subject, and it does not constitute the slightest obstacle in my judgment. I greatly wonder why any gentleman on this floor should have any trouble upon this subject.

But, says my good friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE], the people of Hawaii were not consulted, and therefore we should not

take them into our system of government. Let my honorable friend from Arkansas, or any other gentleman on this floor, tell me when in the history of our country, during all the proceedings by which we annexed and incorporated nearly 3,000,000 square miles of additional territory, the question of annexation was ever submitted to the people of either the territory annexed or of the United States to be acted upon by a direct vote?

Mr. DINSMORE. I will suggest to the gentleman the case of Texas.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. My friend says Texas. I expected that suggestion. Of course we all know the details of the history of the annexation of Texas, and it is needless to relate them here. But perhaps you all do not know one fact in connection with that transaction. The annexation of Texas was first sought by a treaty which failed of passage through the United States Senate, but it was the basis of another and subsequent treaty, and the endeavor to secure the result finally terminated in resolutions which passed the House of Representatives and afterwards the Senate and became a law by the approval of the Executive. After those resolutions were passed the legislature of Texas was convened, and a convention of the people was summoned to consider the then pending propositions.

A constitution was drafted and was adopted by both the legislature and the convention, and later the people were called upon to vote upon the ratification of the acts which had been done by those bodies. The main question at this time was the adoption of the constitution, and the question of annexation was merely incidental. Yet, Mr. Speaker, although the population of Texas at that time, exclusive of Indians, was over 130,000, only about 4,100 votes were cast for ratification. Only 4,000 votes out of a population of more than 100,000. Now, I invite you to compare that vote with the present case. The people of the Hawaiian Islands for more than fifty years have been living under a constitution granted to them by the third Kamehameha, and that constitution from the outset has prescribed the qualifications of electors.

The provisions of this instrument, although changed at various times by the Hawaiian Legislature, has never taken away the right of suffrage from the people. It existed in the time of Kalakaua, and it was one of the prominent reasons which led the late Queen Liliuokalani to attempt the overthrow of the constitutional rights of the people and to bring about a return to the absolutism of the early kings. The present constitution also prescribes the qualifications of electors, and the qualified electors of Hawaii who have spoken upon this subject, directly or indirectly, constitute as large a percentage of the population of Hawaii as did the votes cast upon the ratification of the annexation of Texas taken in comparison with the population of that State.

I was exceedingly glad to learn from the speech of my good friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] that amid all the reasons why the Hawaiian Islands should not be annexed to the United States he freely and frankly admitted that there was one powerful consideration in favor of these resolutions. He says that the possession of the Hawaiian Islands by the United States would greatly increase the power of the American Government to keep foreign nations off our shores. In God's name, what else do we want them for, looking at the subject from a military point of view? We are not seeking the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands to make aggressive war upon the rest of mankind.

The possession of the islands for purposes of public defense is

the exact point, and the only point, for which I am arguing and contending. One of the great reasons why we want and must have those islands is to make it absolutely impossible for a foreign government to assail us, and especially to render it impossible for an Asiatic power, with an Asiatic religion, to seat itself within 2,000 miles of our Pacific coast. In my judgment no admission could be made that would constitute a stronger argument for the adoption of these resolutions than the fair and honest statement of my honorable friend from Arkansas [Mr. DUNSMORE].

Another point of difficulty which troubles my friends who oppose this measure is the question of the cost of maintenance. Upon that question the records of the Hawaiian Government furnish us valuable information. Aggregating the public revenues from 1878 to 1892, and deducting from the aggregate the expenditures during the same period of time, we find that for a period of fourteen years the expenditure over revenue is only \$309,734, notwithstanding the fact that during that period the islands suffered two revolutions, with all the extraordinary expenses incident thereto. In 1896 the public revenues were \$1,997,818 and the aggregate expenditures were \$1,904,190, leaving a balance to the credit of the Government on December 31, 1896, of \$93,627. Under any reasonable administration of affairs by an intelligent territorial government the Hawaiian Islands can be made fully self-supporting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whatever views people may have heretofore had upon this subject, whether those views have been upon general political lines or whether they have proceeded upon commercial lines, we are to-day confronted with the condition of war, and we are compelled to consider this question from a standpoint which the opponents of annexation have always heretofore scouted as a possibility too remote to constitute a reasonable argument. Whether we will or no, we are compelled to look at this subject from that standpoint and legislate with reference to it.

With a voice almost unanimous the people of the United States have declared at the polls and through us, their representatives, that the Island of Cuba shall be hereafter free from the sovereignty of Spain. To make that declaration good and to compel a recognition of that independence by Spain we have declared war upon that Government. By our unanimous voice we have authorized and directed the President of the United States to employ the entire military and naval power of the country, and also its material resources, and have charged him with the tremendous responsibility of conducting that war to a successful issue. Having done that, having charged him with this great and solemn responsibility, we can not, without stultifying ourselves, withhold from him any measure which he thinks is necessary to bring that consummation about.

In the performance of the duties laid upon him by the people and by Congress, he has a right to ask for any provision, no matter what it may be, that will either contribute to the power of attack or will fortify our own country against every contingency that can possibly arise out of a state of war. We are not playing a game of politics or diplomacy to-day. It is war, and in it is bound up not only the freedom of Cuba but the national honor of our own country. That which a few months ago was thought to be too remote for serious consideration is to-day a stern and unalterable fact. I care not what your views or my views upon this subject might be under ordinary circumstances. It is to-day a measure of war, and as such it stands before this Congress, and I envy

not the man who, after having laid upon the President the duty of aggressive attack and also of providing a complete system of harbor and coast-line defense, stops now to split hairs over historical precedents or judicial interpretations of constitutional law.

I envy not the man who in these days of armed conflict will withhold from the President any measure of legislation which in his judgment or in the judgment of his war council is deemed necessary to make his efforts effective. No amount of caviling as to whether the recommendations of the President or the action of Congress were right or wrong, justifiable or unjustifiable; no philanthropic feelings over the sacrifices already made or which shall be made in the future; no protest over the expenditure of money which has been or shall become necessary; no measuring of cause or effect; no predictions as to whether this conflict shall be fought out by Spain and the United States, or whether all the nations of Europe will be involved before the end shall be reached, can avail one jot or tittle to change the grim unalterable fact that we are in a state of war.

Already the field of operations embraces one-third of the water area of the world. Where its limitations will be three months hence no man can tell. Ninety days ago not a man in this House would have ventured the prediction that the first scene of the great drama would open upon the coast of Asia. We thought we were going straightway to Cuba. We never dreamed that the first victory of American arms would be in the far-off archipelago of the Philippines.

Who will venture to predict what the next scene of this swift-moving drama will reveal? Will it be the intervention of the powers to compel Spain to surrender Cuba? Will it be a protest by France against the impairment of her bonded security in Spanish domains, or will it be a German demand for joint occupancy or division of the conquered territory? Will the United States settle this business by force of arms, as she has started to settle it, with Spain alone, or will the next shifting of the scenes reveal an European alliance to protect Spain from destruction, or to play the rôle of Russia in the late war between China and Japan? No man can tell what lies in the future, and in the early future.

While the purposes of the United States in this conflict are directed to freeing the Western Hemisphere from a despotism which for four centuries has been a blight upon civilization and a curse to downtrodden millions of the human race, no man in this presence will dare to say that the American flag, once planted in a just and holy war, at home or abroad, shall ever be removed except by the free act of the American Government.

But, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, while this is unquestionably the high resolve of the American people, it is your duty and the duty of us all as legislators, as citizens, as patriotic lovers of our country, to discard all our preconceived notions about the desirability or non-desirability of the Hawaiian Islands, and to do that which will strengthen our Army and our Navy, and to see to it that every preparation which statesmanship and human ingenuity can devise shall be made, to meet not only the exigencies of the war with Spain, but also every possible exigency that may follow a European alliance created to take from the hands of the United States Government the settlement of the questions which may logically arise out of this conflict.

I do not know that such an alliance will come to pass. It is enough for me to know that it is one of the possibilities of the

future, a possibility which has some threatening aspects at the present time. Notwithstanding the bold and remarkable statement of Mr. Chamberlain, I do not believe in relying upon the sympathetic interference of Great Britain, or of Japan, or of any other country. I would rather rely upon the physical strength and resourceful power of our own 70,000,000 liberty-loving people than upon the sympathy of any foreign nation, however friendly, or upon all Europe combined. God helps those who help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a rude awakening since this crisis began. Fortunately for us, and perhaps fortunate for the world, we have had to deal with a nation infinitely weaker than ourselves in material resources, and as illy prepared to meet the exigencies of a great war. Less than five years ago nearly 1,000 cities and towns located upon open ports and upon tributary streams along and contiguous to our 5,000 miles of coast were absolutely defenseless against foreign attack. Five years ago the Navy of the United States was the weakest of the first-class powers and, for lack of munitions and crews practiced in the service of modern ordnance, was comparatively useless for offensive or defensive war; and yet, Mr. Speaker, we were asserting against every nation in Europe a doctrine of exclusion from the Western Hemisphere, never recognized as a tenet of international law, and depending alone for its maintenance upon the moral influence of this Republic. However just and necessary the Monroe doctrine may be from our standpoint of view, and however deep-rooted it may be in the conscience of the American people, it is unquestionably an affront to every nation in Europe, and is to-day acknowledged with illy concealed reluctance by Japan in her relations with the Hawaiian Islands.

I warn gentlemen on this floor that we have seen enough in the last twelve months to satisfy any reflecting man, that the perpetuation of the Monroe doctrine can only be made possible by the speedy development of the naval power of the United States up to a degree of efficiency that will enable us at all times to successfully resist the encroachments of any government on earth. What does this involve, Mr. Speaker? Shall we rely upon the integrity of foreign alliances? Why, sir, no such convention was ever made anywhere or at any time but it was torn into shreds at the dictation of self-interest or by the shifting demands of oncoming exigencies.

I venture the assertion that if Congress had given heed twenty years ago to the warnings which have been iterated and reiterated over and over again on this floor, every American port would to-day be impregnable against assault, our Navy would be peerless upon the seas, no war with Spain would ever have occurred, three hundred millions of money would have been saved, Cuba would be free, her people, wasted by starvation and savagery, would be on the high road of progress, and the *Maine*, instead of rotting beneath the loathsome waters of Havana Harbor with her murdered crew, would be riding the waves.

I ask again, Mr. Speaker, what does the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine involve? We are not so wise, our rights and responsibilities are not so small, our statesmanship is not so far-seeing, but that we can learn a lesson of wisdom from our competitors in the race for national development. With the advent of steam as a motive power Great Britain, without halting for the evolution of the future, began immediately to reconstruct her navy. New armaments and dry docks followed hard after, and

then began the establishment of that wonderful system of supply stations which to-day belt the world. While continental Europe and America remained wrapped up in the conservatism of the fathers, Great Britain pushed forward into the new order of things until at every coigne of military and commercial vantage, at Gibraltar, at Malta, at Port Said, at Aden, at Bombay, at Calcutta, at Madras, at Colombo, at Singapore, at Sydney, at Melbourne, at New Zealand, at Hongkong, at Victoria, and at Vancouver, she sits intrenched with limitless stores to reenforce her naval power. For the purposes of this consideration it matters not whether we praise or condemn her foreign and colonial policy. She sits complacent behind her naval ramparts, mistress of the seas, with incalculable powers of defense and offense, able and ready to vindicate her sovereignty everywhere, and to guarantee at all times safety to every advance agent of her commercial enterprise.

Ages before Columbus lifted the veil from the Western Hemisphere Asiatic commerce was the pursuit of empires. Along its shifting routes, from the Phœnicians down to the present day, great cities have risen and passed away, their aggrandizement and decay inexorably measured by their ability to adapt themselves to new developments or by their disposition to hold on to obsolete and worn-out systems. Constantinople, Genoa, Venice, Lisbon, and Amsterdam have each in its day gathered wealth and splendor from the inexhaustible stores of the Orient, and each has fallen from leadership in proportion as it has kept its eye on the past rather than upon the future. England, looking behind, saw the cities of the Mediterranean rise and fall with the shifting of control over the great thoroughfares to Asia. Looking into the future, she saw a great productive population gathering upon the eastern coast of America, spreading in great waves over a continent, subduing mountains and harnessing rivers to its uses, while it reached out across the Pacific for a share in that wonderful commerce. Foreseeing the magnitude of this new competition, she bought the control of the Suez Canal, deepened and widened its channel, enlarged her ship capacity from 3,500 to 7,000 tons, and reduced her freight charges from \$7 to \$3 per long ton. Not content with that provision of security, she built a transcontinental railway through Canada and established a steamship line from Vancouver to China and Australia. Not content with that provision, she undertook to gain a lodgment at the mouth of the Orinoco, in defiance of the Monroe doctrine, and is to-day reaching for an isthmian route to the Indies, to fortify and still further facilitate her monopoly of oriental commerce.

Now, what is all this to us? In the first place, Mr. Speaker, it emphasizes the fact that while the development of the American Navy is absolutely essential to the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine, and to the development of our commerce with foreign nations, and to the protection of our own coast against foreign attack, a navy without practicable and defensible coaling stations is as useless as an army without food.

No man can foresee the potentiality of the forces which are gathering on the Asiatic coast. With Great Britain in India, in Polynesia, in the Malachian Straits, and in Hongkong, with France in Cambodia, with Russia in Manchuria, with Germany in her newly acquired Chinese ports, and with Japan pushing forward with prodigious strides, it is apparent on the face of the situation that the United States must either surrender the commerce which

she has already acquired or she must fortify herself by all the means known to the establishment of commercial power, and which have been advantageous agencies in the experience of competing nations.

It is for these reasons, looking at the subject from a standpoint of national defense and national progress, that I have for many years advocated the peaceful acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands. I happen to have been twice in the Hawaiian Islands. I was there first in 1831, and as a result of that visit I became and have ever since remained an ardent advocate of annexation, believing that action to be not only desirable but necessary, and both not only from a military but from a commercial point of view. I am not guided by any party or political declarations upon this subject. I was thoroughly convinced years ago that the acquisition of these islands, with the facilities afforded in Pearl Harbor, was absolutely necessary in order to a successful defense of our Pacific coast.

From a military point of view the most interesting feature in these islands is the harbor which I have already mentioned. It is situated in the island of Oahu, about 7 miles from the city of Honolulu. The distance from the harbor to the open sea is about 4 miles, and they are connected by a narrow passage not more than a third of a mile in width. At the outer end of this passage there is a sand bar, easily removable at a cost of about \$100,000. In this harbor there are 3 square miles of water which is from 5 to 10 fathoms deep, and an area of smaller size from 2 to 4 fathoms in depth. The locality is free from storms of sufficient severity to endanger shipping, and in the neighborhood are abundant supplies of fresh and healthful water.

The harbor approaches are easily defensible, and it is calculated by military experts that \$500,000 will make it substantially impregnable against naval attacks. Here the entire American Navy can ride in absolute security. There are no other inclosed harbors in the entire group, and none other exists for thousands of miles west or south. Throughout the eastern two-thirds of the North Pacific Ocean it is the only place available as a naval and coaling station outside the American coast. The control of Pearl Harbor, therefore, gives to the nation which holds it the mastery of the Pacific Ocean north of the Equator, and it is, therefore, of incalculable strategic value to the United States. A foreign power possessing Pearl Harbor would be within easy striking distance of the Pacific coast, and in case of war would have the ability to speedily annihilate, not only American commerce on the open Pacific Ocean, but also our coastwise trade, from Alaska to its southernmost point.

What stronger argument for the possession of the Hawaiian Islands can be conceived of than the fact that our Philippine fleet, if compelled by the exigencies of war or by stress of weather to abandon its present vantage ground, has no place of safety or supply short of the harbor of San Francisco, and is subject, while perhaps in a crippled condition, to pursuit and attack throughout that entire distance until within the sheltering embrace of the Golden Gate?

Captain Mahan, whose splendid essay upon sea power has excited the applause of the world, says in a recent paper:

It is not practicable for any trans-Pacific country to invade our Pacific coast without occupying Hawaii as a base.

And further:

It is obvious that if we do not hold these islands ourselves we can not expect the neutrals in the war to prevent the other belligerents from occupying them, nor can the inhabitants themselves prevent it. In short, we should need a larger navy to defend the Pacific coast, because we should have to not only defend our own coast but to prevent by naval force an enemy from occupying the islands, whereas if we preoccupied them fortifications would preserve them to us.

Another eminent authority, George Melville, Chief Engineer of the United States Navy, says:

Hawaii bridges the stretch of seas, which, without the island group, would be, at this stage in the development of marine propulsion, impassable to an enemy's fleet. Pearl Harbor is the sole key to the full defense of our western coast, and that key should lie in our grasp only.

It does not make a particle of difference what the condition of China is to-day. In the philosophy of that mysterious people, "waiting" is the most God-like of human virtues—all things come to him who waits. It matters not how friendly Japan is under present circumstances. It is of no importance that England and Russia are engrossed in a contest for commercial supremacy in the far East. There is not an exigency in the great drama of the world's politics to-day that may not be shifted into new relations and unexpected contests to-morrow.

While Pearl Harbor can be made a veritable Gibraltar in point of impregnability, it forms an unparalleled vantage ground from which a naval force can sail with a full equipment of coal and munitions for attack in any quarter. Again says this eminent authority:

Pearl Harbor would form a first line of defense, and an enemy from the open sea would violate some of the cardinal principles of naval strategy and invite sure disaster in attacking our western coast without first blockading or defeating the Hawaiian squadron.

Says Admiral Belknap:

A glance at a chart of the Pacific will indicate to the most casual observer the great importance and inestimable value of this island as a strategic point. Indeed, it would seem that nature had established that group to be ultimately occupied as an outpost, as it were, of the great Republic on its western border, and that the time had now come for the fulfillment of said design.

Lieutenant-General Schofield, after a personal examination of the Hawaiian Islands, expressed the following cogent views:

I have always regarded the ultimate annexation of the islands as a public necessity. I have likened that harbor to a commanding position in front of a defensive line which the army in the field is compelled to occupy. The army must occupy that advance position and hold it at whatever cost or else the enemy will occupy it with his artillery and dominate the main line. If we do not occupy and fortify Pearl Harbor, our enemy will occupy it as a base from which to conduct operations against our Pacific coast and the Isthmian Canal. One of the great advantages of Pearl Harbor to us consists in the fact that no navy would be required to defend it. It is a deep land-locked arm of the sea, easily defended by fortifications placed near its mouth, with its anchorage beyond the reach of guns from the ocean. Cruisers and other war ships which might be overpowered at sea, as well as merchant vessels, would find there beyond the land defenses absolute security against naval attack.

The following is the opinion of Admiral Dupont on this phase of the subject:

It is impossible to estimate too highly the value and importance of the Sandwich Islands, whether in a commercial or military point of view. Should circumstances place them in our hands, they would prove a most important acquisition intimately connected with our commercial supremacy in those seas.

The unqualified and concurring judgment of these distinguished scientists do not by any means stand alone. Everybody who has examined the subject from the standpoint of national defense, and whose opinion is entitled to consideration, is equally emphatic,

whereas not a strategist of experience and recognized ability has ever presented an opinion contrary to the expressions which I have taken the liberty to quote. Whatever views members may have upon other phases of the subject, unquestionably from a military standpoint the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands stands before Congress as a measure equal, if not superior, in importance and urgency to the construction of the Nicaraguan Canal.

Mr. Speaker, I have a profound respect and an instinctive feeling of deference for the opinions of the distinguished ex-Secretary of State who has just retired to private life after a career unsurpassed by that of any American statesman for usefulness and wisdom; but I can not agree with his contention that the Government of the United States has an indefeasible title to Pearl Harbor, irrespective of the maintenance or abrogation of the reciprocity treaty now existing. The grant of an usufructory interest in that harbor was made in consideration of the provisions of that treaty, not in perpetuity, but constructively during the life of the treaty. It is a part of the treaty, and in my judgment is inseparable from it. Its abrogation terminates all of its subsisting provisions, and it would be a violent assumption to hold that the rights vested thereby would continue to exist after the basis upon which they stand had been destroyed by the action of the American Government.

I can not see any validity in the proposition that the American Government can exercise its right to terminate the treaty in twelve months after notice, and notwithstanding that termination hold on to one of the chief considerations of the grant. To do so, even if we had the power to do it, would be a manifest fraud on the Hawaiian Government, and could never find support and countenance in the moral sense of the American people. No such proposition ever entered into the negotiations which culminated in that convention, or in its renewal, nor has it ever existed, nor does it exist to-day in the understanding of the Hawaiian Government. Such is the statement not only of the premier of the Hawaiian Government, but also of Mr. Bayard, late Secretary of State.

If that group of islands should pass by voluntary cession into the sovereignty of a European state, or, through the operations of the peaceful invasion of the Japanese, which during the last ten years has increased that population from 2,700 to nearly if not quite 32,000, should become directly or indirectly absorbed into the Japanese system, I can not for one moment believe that any such pretension of the United States to the ownership of Pearl Harbor would be admitted by any court of international arbitration. In the face of such conditions, either the one or the other of which is more than a probability, the assertion of the Monroe doctrine or of an exclusive proprietary interest in Pearl Harbor would inevitably precipitate another foreign war. Irrespective of any other consideration, the avoidance of such a risk is, in my judgment, of transcendent importance.

Mr. Speaker, the splendid domain of the Hawaiian Islands, situated within the arc of our existing possessions, is to-day offered with all rights of sovereignty to the United States as the free gift of the existing and established Government, together with all public lands and property, and with no condition whatsoever beyond the assumption of the public debt to the maximum amount of \$4,000,000. If accepted by the passage of this measure, that great entrepôt, lying in the highway of the future commerce of the

East and the West, will peacefully pass into the possession of the American people, assuring to them perpetual immunity from hostile attack, a strategic position of incalculable value in time of war, a harbor of refuge in storm or calamity, and a magnificent supply station for our Navy and merchant marine through all the exigencies of our country's future.

If, on the contrary, Congress shuts the door upon this tender, the Hawaiian Islands must of necessity pass under foreign dominion. Not one of the constituent elements of the Hawaiian population is sufficiently strong to maintain for any prolonged period of time an independent form of government against internecine conflict or foreign aggression. If we refuse to extend our own sovereignty and protection, the United States can not, with any show of justice or sanction of right recognizable by other nations, invoke the principles of the Monroe doctrine against a voluntary treaty of cession to Great Britain or to Germany or to France, which may become necessary to the preservation of the rights and the protection of the lives of the Hawaiian people against domestic or foreign violence.

But whether as a matter of principle the Monroe doctrine could be applied or whether it could not be, yet, nevertheless, in the absence of a voluntary cession to a European power, the gravitation to Japan and finally absorption by that country will be the inevitable destiny of the Hawaiian people. Under the constitution of that Republic it is easy to be seen that it is only a matter of time when the Japanese population may lawfully acquire control of all the legislative and administrative functions of the Government, in which event the transition to a colonial system, autonomous in its character, but yielding allegiance to the Emperor, would be altogether too imperceptible to justify interference at any particular period of time, or even to render interference possible without a war with that Empire. Thus, by a movement similar to those which have heretofore characterized the migration of nations, there would be eventually precipitated that greatest of all conceivable calamities, the planting of an Asiatic population and the founding of an Asiatic cult two-thirds of the stretch across the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, another point of contention against this measure is that by the acquisition of these islands we will largely increase our coast line necessary to be defended, and therefore the acquisition would be a source of weakness rather than of strength. There is no force in this contention. Pearl Harbor is the only landlocked harbor in the entire Hawaiian group, and the only place that could be made available as a naval base. In the possession of the United States, no foreign enemy could maintain a lodgment anywhere on the entire coast line for any purpose whatsoever. Susceptible of being made as impregnable as Gibraltar, it has the superior advantage of being a refuge against storm as well as against superior forces, while it is a coign of vantage from which every trade route in the Southern Pacific can be flanked, giving unparalleled facilities for the assailing or defending commerce, and absolutely dominating not only the island coast line, but also every ocean highway from Alaska to the Equator.

After traversing all the waters of the globe, I know of no position which can be so cheaply fortified or maintained, which will give to the Government so great an influence in maritime commerce, and which can be made so tremendously effective in the possible conflicts of the future.

Aside from strategic considerations, common justice to a weak and defenseless neighbor demands that the United States shall either recognize the neutrality obligations of a noncombatant or else shall eliminate those obligations from the forum of future contentions by an incorporation into our own system. We are to-day using the Island of Oahu as a base of supplies and a naval station in open defiance of the well-recognized laws governing neutral powers and in absolute contradiction of our own demand upon all other nations in the world.

Can anyone doubt that the principles of the *Alabama* case would determine the judgment of any court of international arbitration if a call for damages should be hereafter made upon Hawaii by the Government of Spain? Can anyone doubt that the collection of a judgment by seizure of Hawaiian revenues, or the occupation of Hawaiian territory until satisfaction was rendered, would be upheld by European nations in spite of the Monroe doctrine unless the United States paid the award? Our action already taken is absolutely indefensible upon any other theory than that the treaty already concluded gives quasi jurisdictional rights pending ratification.

The annexation of Hawaii is wholly disconnected from and independent of any questions growing out of our contest with Spain. Repeating what I have heretofore said, this subject in one form or another has been before the American people and before Congress for over fifty years, and it would have been accomplished long ago had it not been for the contentions of political parties and the overshadowing exigencies of the civil war. No proposition of colonial establishment has ever entered into the negotiations of the two Governments. The treaty of 1893 and also that of 1897 both provided that the Hawaiian Islands shall be incorporated into the territory of the United States as an integral part thereof, and shall be known as the Territory of Hawaii, and as such shall be governed by such laws as Congress shall enact.

The undertaking to connect this subject with the fate of the Philippine Islands, of Puerto Rico, is simply and solely a makeshift of the opposition to defeat this measure by the sinuous arts of parliamentary tactics, notwithstanding the fact that a vast majority of the American people have already substantially voted for annexation and that a majority of both Houses of this Congress are waiting to vote for it at the earliest possible opportunity.

Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, although for twenty years I have been convinced of the wisdom of this proceeding from every standpoint of view, present and future, yet, laying aside all other considerations which relate to commercial development and the progress of civilization, it is enough for me to know that the President of the United States, charged with the responsibility of prosecuting this war to a successful issue, regards the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands as a military necessity. With that knowledge I will give him my loyal support, and I will never consent that this session of Congress shall adjourn until these resolutions have been fully acted upon.

Mr. Speaker, there is no novelty in the objections which are urged against this measure. They were urged against the purchase of Louisiana in 1803. The Federalists of that day challenged the constitutionality of the acquisition, and even Mr. Jefferson questioned it. But Congress and the Supreme Court decided otherwise. They were urged against the annexation of Texas by the Abolitionists of the North and by many statesmen of the South. Whole tomes of statistics were summoned to prove

that the heterogeneous population gathered within those districts could never be ameliorated, and would prove to be an eternal menace to our republican institutions. But they were annexed nevertheless, and to-day they are teeming with wealth, intelligence, and industrial energy. They were urged against the acquisition of New Mexico and California, and one of the greatest speeches Webster ever made was an invective against that terra incognita. Nevertheless, nearly \$20,000,000 was given as the price of that territory, and it has proven to be an inexhaustible storehouse of mineral and agricultural wealth. They were urged still more vehemently against the purchase of Alaska, and Mr. Seward was charged with political lunacy for paying eight millions of good money for a region of eternal icebergs. But, Mr. Speaker, in all these so-called unconstitutional, irrational, and unstatesmanlike performances we builded wiser than we knew, and out of those vast regions of tropical jungle and arctic waste a great nation has grown up to subdue the sterile places of the earth and to bless humanity. Who to-day would turn backward this wonderful march of progress? Who would not rather carry it forward, relying upon the inspirations and the strength of American intelligence and upon the providence of Almighty God?

Mr. Speaker, it is urged that the people of the Hawaiian Islands are incapable of self-government, and therefore annexation must necessarily be hostile to the best interests of the American people. Of the present constituent elements of Hawaiian population, the Chinese, numbering nearly 22,000, can safely be regarded as only temporary sojourners in the islands. With the application of American laws against further immigration, the immediate outgo of this element will begin; and in a comparatively short period of time they will become greatly reduced in point of numbers, if they do not entirely disappear. The Japanese are fairly good material for future citizenship. They are acquisitive of knowledge, industrious and economical, and easily molded in the forms and usages of the society in which they locate.

Taking the native Hawaiians, Portuguese, the British, the Germans, and the Americans into consideration, the percentage of intelligence existing at the present time among these elements is as large as that which exists in any of the new sections of our own country. Out of 15,191 Portuguese residents, 48.8 per cent were born on the islands. The percentage of industrials is over 91 per cent of the entire working population, fully up to the showing of the most advanced nations of the world. Of 93,105 people over 6 years of age, 63.9 per cent are able to read and write. Excluding the Portuguese, the Japanese, and the Chinese, the percentage of those able to read and write rises to nearly 86 per cent.

The percentage of children attending school is still more remarkable. The total number of children within the school age—viz. 6 to 15—was reported in 1896 to be 14,286, out of which the school attendants were 13,744, or 96.2 per cent, an increase of nearly 15 per cent over 1890 and over 25 per cent over 1884. While the natives of full Hawaiian blood appear to be decreasing, the native born of mixed Hawaiian stock is very largely on the increase, such births rising from 1,563 in 1880 to 2,590 in 1896, a gain of 65 per cent. The children born in the islands of parents both foreign have increased from 5,018 in 1890 to 8,339 in 1896, a gain of 66 per cent.

These increases are mostly among Hawaiians, Europeans, and Americans, showing the rise of a new stock thoroughly amenable to the influences of Anglican civilization, into which it is rap-

idly merging year by year. The contention, therefore, that there is any antagonism, physical, moral, intellectual, or social, between the people who can be regarded as permanent residents of the Hawaiian Islands and the people of the United States is no more valid than the early contention that the people of Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, and California would never coalesce with the Anglo-Saxon population of the original States.

COMMERCIAL CONSIDERATIONS.

Mr. Speaker, I have been considering this measure more particularly from the standpoint of the proposition that the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands at this time is necessary for the proper protection of the Pacific coast. A word or two upon the commercial side of this question as it relates to the future prosperity of the United States. For a quarter of a century the demand has come from every quarter of our country for the enlargement of our foreign commerce, and yet during all that time not a single measure of substantial importance has ever been enacted by Congress or by any commercial body of the United States which constitutes a basis upon which that enlargement can proceed.

Outside of Honolulu and the cities of Mexico and Gaudalajara there is not an American office of exchange in any foreign port of the Western Hemisphere or in the oriental world where an American negotiation can be carried on. Every commercial bill, every loan of money, every mercantile and affreightment contract, has to be negotiated in an English office and pay tribute in one form or another to English enterprise. Everywhere, in Mexico, in Central and South America, in Polynesia, in India, in Ceylon, in the Straits Settlements, in China, in Japan, and even in Hawaii, English institutions exist, founded under the broad, far-reaching policy of the British Government to increase and monopolize every branch of foreign trade, and not until the people of this country outgrow the swaddling clothes bequeathed to them by the narrow policy of "insular isolation" will they ever have a permanent share in the mighty commerce which beats its wings in the waves of the broad Pacific.

In the face of the universally recognized need of the Nicaragua Canal we have been wasting precious time haggling and splitting hairs over the difference between minimum and maximum estimates of cost when the gain to American commerce in every year after its construction will be more than the entire expenditure. The progressive enterprise of the United States, the manufacturers of the North, the cotton growers of the South, the farmers of Oregon and California, all demand a short route between the oceans, and the peerless voyage of the *Oregon* to join the front battle line in our war with Spain emphasizes that demand with an eloquence beyond the power of human speech.

The construction of this great waterway connecting the two oceans, following upon the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands, and the independence of Cuba, will reach a consummation not less magnificent than those splendid transactions which in the early history of our country laid the foundations of national wealth, national power, and national glory, all which have been the wonder of the world and the honorable pride of every American citizen. Powerful to resist attack from without, loving peace at home and abroad, this great country will then have reached the acme of its destiny, and its beneficent influence upon the nations and the peoples of the earth will be the glory of the twentieth century.